ζ

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,176	06/19/2002	Constantine Grancharov	22993-2	1130

29127   7590   04/18/2007

HOUSTON ELISEEVA
4 MILITIA DRIVE, SUITE 4
LEXINGTON, MA 02421

EXAMINER
TANG, KAREN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/064,176	GRANCHAROV ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Karen C. Tang	2151	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 February 2007</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-27 and 29-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-27 and 29-41</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

- This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks file on 2/26/07.

- Claims 1-9, 11-27, 29-44 are amended are for further examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/26/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Garcia-Chiesa is directed towards a different kind of dynamic URL than that discussed in the subject application. Applicants respectfully submit that Garcia-Chiesa is directed towards a specific solution to a problem created by a specific software package, namely that Lotus Notes/Domino generate URLs in a fashion that creates problems for web crawling applications (see paras. 0027, 0028). Applicants also submit that the teachings in Garcia-Chiesa are not applicable outside of the context of Lotus Domino web servers. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that there would be no motivation to combine this application with either Kraft or Stem. Applicants further respectfully submit that, even if Garcia-Chiesa were to be combined with Kraft and Stem, the result would not be the same as the subject application. This is because Garcia-Chiesa is directed towards a different kind of dynamic URL than that discussed in the subject application. Paragraph 0030 of Garcia-Chiesa states that "while WWW Search-Engines normally expect the sites to be primarily "static", Lotus Domino sites are inherently dynamic". Applicants respectfully submit, however, that in Garcia-Chiesa, the Lotus Domino site is described as "dynamic" because the URLs in the site and the content of the site are derived from the contents of the Lotus Notes database on the server. The URLs that link the content within the site are generated on the server by Lotus Notes/Domino. The URLs would be

said to be static if they corresponded directly to a file resident on the file system of a web server, since they do not they are dynamic. Applicants respectfully submit that, by contrast, the present application describes, with reference to amended claim 1 as submitted herewith, "a script URL resolution component for loading said one or more webpages, causing examination of said one or more specific portions of script code selected during the crawling which are used to dynamically create one or more script URLs and causing execution of said one or more selected portions of the script code to obtain said one or more script URLs." Applicants respectfully submit that the phrase "dynamically create one or more script URLs" describes a completely different variety of dynamicism from that described in Garcia-Chiesa. In the case of the subject application, the process of dynamically creating URLs is accomplished by scripts located within the code that forms the webpage. Thus, with regard to the subject application, the script URLs are not created until the script is executed. However, once created, the script URL itself is static in that it corresponds directly to a file resident on the file system of a web server. Applicants further respectfully submit that Garcia-Chiesa refers to creating URLs by examining the Lotus Notes/Domino database as part of a server-side process and converting the dynamic URLs into "special URLs" by assigning the document a unique logical name that describes its location on the database (see para. 0059). The subject application, on the other hand, is concerned specifically with script URLs and a means of discovering the URLs already embedded in a client script on a webpage that creates the URLs (see paras. 0028 and 0029). Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of Garcia-Chiesa are not applicable to the technical problem addressed in the subject application and that, as a result, it would not be obvious for a skilled technician to combine Garcia-Chiesa with Stern and Kraft. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that

even if such a combination were to take place, the result would not equal the invention discussed

in the subject application, nor would it render this invention obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art in light of this unlikely combination. With regard to the Examiner's objections based on

Stern and Kraft, Applicants respectfully repeat and rely upon the arguments raised in their

communication of July 10, 2006, namely that Stern teaches away from a URL resolution system

that can execute script code contained on a webpage and that Kraft does not discuss the

execution of only certain specific portions of the code that relate to dynamic URL creation.

Nonetheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application and better define the

scope of the protection being sought, Applicants have amended claims 1, 26, 39-42 and 44 for

reasons of clarity only, further specifying the loading of the webpage by the script URL

resolution component. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the objections

under USC 103(a) against these amended claims.

Examiner respectfully traversed the argument. First – According to the specification of

the instant application (Page 4) and the remark/argument of the applicant, indicate the what

applicant intended to consider "script URL" as URL created by the script code, which, the script

code, indicated by applicant, on page 1, 0003, is common to use script code to construct web

page link, i.e., to create URL dynamically. Also, within the specification, there's no intended

consideration as for what is "dynamically create one or more script URLs". However, within

applicant's argument filed on February 26, 2007, applicant indicate "the process of dynamically

creating URLs is accomplished by scripts located within the code that forms the webpage. Thus,

with regard to the subject application, the script URLs are not created until the script is

executed", which describe what is intended to consider "dynamically create one or more script

URLs" as. After carefully reviewed all cited references (Stern, Kraft, and Garcia-Chiesa), it has

been determined that Kraft, is double teaching what applicant's consideration of "dynamically

create one or more script URLs" (web pages are made my HTML, and is composed of script

code, therefore, the system of Kraft dynamically extract/(execute JavaScript algorithm) the URL

from the HTML web page, which makes it the script URL). Further, as being admitted by

applicant, Kraft teaches the limitation in the static environment. Meanwhile, Garcia-Chiesa, also

taught the limitation that is teach by Kraft, where "dynamically create one or more script URL"

being teach/suggest which, the invention go through all the static contents (web sites, which is

made of script code, refer to 0045) and utilizing the algorithm to extract the URL (de-HTML,

refer to 0046), and form the URL, which is the script URL. Even if, like what applicant argued,

Garcia-Chiesa utilizing Lotus Domino technologies, which is dynamic environment, but the

invention still, utilized the proper algorithm on the web pages, which is the static environment, to

generate the script URL. Whether dynamically or statically, the combination of Stern, Kraft and

Garcia-Chiesa fully fulfill all the limitation that is being claimed in the instant application.

Furthermore, it appears that dynamically creating one or more URL is a common practice that is

indicated in the applicant's specification.

Applicant is welcomed to further define/claim the details of the instant application in order to

distinguish the differences between prior arts and the instant application.

Regarding with amended portion of instant application "loading said one or more webpages,.",

which is a job of the crawler that it go through/load websites/webpages, in order to exam the

script code on the webpage (webpage is formed by script code: HTML).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-27, 29-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Stern et al (US 2002/0052928) hereinafter Stern in view of Kraft et al (US

2002/0147637) hereinafter Kraft in further view of Garcia-Chiesa (US 2002/0099723).

1. Referring to Claims 1, 26, 42, 43 and 44, Stern discloses a URL resolution system for

resolving Universal Resource Locators (URLs) (refer to Title and Abstract), the URL resolution

system comprising:

a website crawler (refer to 11, Fig 1) for crawling a website comprising one or more webages

(refer to 0055) locating script code (refer to 0115) and selecting script code that possesses one or

more script URLs (refer to 0115); and portion which are used to dynamically create one or more

script URLSs (refer to 0055 and refer to 0115);

a script URL resolution component for loading said one or more webpages (crawler that it go

through/load websites/webpages, in order to exam the script code on the webpage (webpage is

formed by script code: HTML) causing examination of said one or more specific portions of the

script code selected during the crawling to obtain the script URL which are used to dynamically

create one or more script URLs (refer to 0115 - 0144).

Stern does not expressly indicate execution of the script code to obtain the script URL.

Kraft discloses execution of the script code to obtain the script URL (refer to 0070).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

create a new URL by executing the script code from the web-pages.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that it is convenient to make the system dynamic by

forming the URL by executing the codes.

Stern nor Kraft disclose dynamically create one or more script URLs.

Garcia-Chiesa disclosed dynamically create one or more script URLs (refer to 0030, 0043).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the Stern,

Kraft, and Garcia-Chiesa are analogues.

Stern nor Kraft disclosed wherein said URL resolution system comprises a presentation unit to

report non-resolving or broken URLs to a user.

Kraft disclosed wherein said URL resolution system comprises a presentation unit to report non-

resolving or broken URLs to a user (refer to 0021, 0043 and 0061).

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been by dynamically generate the script

URLs, increase the flexibility and accuracy of the system while crawling through websites so

that user can reduce the time spent while browsing the non-working web pages generated by the

crawlers (refer to 0043 - Garcia-Chiesa).

2. Referring to Claim 2, Stern discloses wherein the website includes one or more web pages

(refer to abstract), and the website crawler crawls individual web pages associated with websites

(refer to 0049-0054), and has a crawling controller for controlling the website crawler (It is

inherent that the crawler consists of a controller because it is a form of software and computer consists of a processor, abstract, is a controller which control all software within the system.).

3. Referring to Claims 3 and 27, Stern discloses wherein the website crawler has a script code detector for determining if a web page uses script code to dynamically create at least one script URL (refer to 0115 - 0118).

4. Referring to Claim 5, Stern discloses wherein the crawling controller receives results of script code examination from the script URL resolution component, and controls the website crawler based on the examination results (0112-0144, the processor, computer, provides the result back to the crawler by providing all the token as results).

5. Referring to Claim 6, Stern discloses wherein the examination results include the script URL when the script code examination is successful, and the crawling controller controls the web crawler to crawl a web page identified by the script URL (refer to 0115 – 0144 and 0223).

6. Referring to Claims 7 and 34, Stern discloses wherein the crawling controller (It is inherent that the crawler consists of a controller because it is a form of software and computer consists of a processor, abstract, is a controller which control all software within the system) controls the website crawler to crawl multiple web pages in parallel (refer to 0077).

7. Referring to Claims 8 and 33, Stern discloses wherein controller controls the website crawler to crawl the web page identified by the script URL immediately (refer to 0115 – 0144 and 0222 - 0223).

8. Referring to Claims 9 and 35, Stern discloses wherein the crawling controller controls the website crawler to queue the web page identified by the script URL for crawling at a later time (refer to 0115 – 0144 and 0223 -0225).

9. Referring to Claims 11, 29 and 31, Stern discloses wherein the website includes one or more web pages (refer to 0115-0144), the script code has a specific part that is used to create the script URL (refer to 0118-0140), and the script URL resolution component comprises'. a web page loading controller (web browser, refer to 0026) for instructing a web page examiner to load the web page located by the website crawler (refer to 0111); and a script code execution controller for instructing the web page examiner to execute the specific part of the script code used in the loaded web page to obtain the script URL (refer to 0115-0144).

10. Referring to Claim 13, Stern discloses wherein the script code execution controller (Data Extractor, refer to 0223) uses an execution function of the web page examiner to execute the specific part of the script code (refer to 0115 – 0144).

11. Referring to Claim 15, Stern discloses wherein the script URL resolution component outputs an execution result including the script URL (refer to 0225) when the execution of the script

code is successful, and the website crawler performs crawling of a web page identified by the

script URL (refer to 0111).

12. Referring to Claim 16, Stern discloses wherein the script URL resolution component outputs

an examination result (refer to 0225) including a failure result when the examination of the script

code fails (refer to 0111 – 0113 and 0224).

13. Referring to Claim 17, Stern discloses wherein the URL resolution system further comprises

a presentation unit to present the examination result to a user (it is inherent that computer

consists of monitor which would load the web page/result to the screen, refer to 0002, and 0049).

14. Referring to Claim 18, Stern discloses wherein the script URL resolution component (URL,

refer to 0084) is provided as a part of the URL resolution system (refer to Title and Abstract).

15. Referring to Claim 19, Stern discloses wherein the script URL resolution component is

provided as a part of the website crawler (refer to 0115-0144).

16. Referring to Claims 12 and 20, Stern discloses wherein the website crawler includes the web

page examiner (refer to 0115-0144 and 0081).

17. Referring to Claim 21, Stern discloses wherein the website has one or more web pages, and

the script URL resolution component is a script URL gatherer for locating each URL contained

in any of the web pages of the website and causing examination of a web page identified by each

URL to resolve script code contained in the web page to obtain any script URL created by the

script code (refer to 0055, 0115 - 0144).

18. Referring to Claim 22, Stern discloses further comprising an advanced web page examiner

having: a web page loader (web page browser, refer to 0074 - 0081) for loading a web page

identified by a URL received from the script URL gatherer (0115-0144), and a script code

examiner (compiler, which is inherently embedded in the system that examine the script code)

for examining the loaded web page to resolve any script URL that is created by script code in the

loaded web page.

19. Referring to Claim 23, Stern discloses wherein the script code examiner (compiler, which is

inherently embedded in the system that examine the script code) executes script code found in

the loaded web page, and returns the execution result (refer to 0055, 0119-0140) to the script

URL gatherer (database, refer to 14, Fig 1).

20. Referring to Claim 24, Stern discloses wherein the advanced web page examiner (database

queries, refer to 0032) is provided as a part of the URL resolution system (refer to 0068).

21. Referring to Claim 25, Stern discloses wherein the website crawler further comprises a script

code detector for detecting a web page that uses script code to create at least one script URL

(refer to 0144); and the script URL gatherer (database, refer to 14, Fig 1) sends to the advanced

web page examiner a URL of the web page detected by the script code detector (refer to 0031 –

0032 and 0115-0144).

22. Referring to Claim 30, Stern discloses wherein the loading step comprises a step of

instructing a web page examiner to load the located web page (refer to 0080 - 0081).

23. Referring to Claim 32, Stern discloses a step of continuing crawling of a web page identified

by the script URL (refer to 0144).

24. Referring to Claim 36, Stern discloses wherein a website has one or more web pages (refer to

0144) and the locating step comprises steps of finding a URL in the web pages (refer to 0115-

0144), and examining a web page identified by the URL to locate script code in the web page

identified by the URL (refer to 0111, 0161-0221).

25. Referring to Claim 37, Stern discloses a step of selecting a web page that contains script code

that is used to dynamically create at least one script URL (refer to 0115-0144), and wherein the

examining step examines the selected web page (refer to 0111-0113, and 0222).

26. Referring to Claim 38, Stern discloses obtaining examination results including the script

URL when the examination step is successful (refer to 0115 – 0144 and 0223) and a failure result

when the examination step fails to obtain the script URL (refer to 0224); and presenting to a user

the examination result including the script URL and/or the failure result (refer to 0031).

27. Referring to Claim 39, Stern discloses a computer readable medium storing (refer to 0082) the instructions and/or statements for use in the execution in a computer of a method for resolving Universal Resource Locators (URLs) (links/URL consists of statement which use to execute/load webpages on a monitor.), the method comprising steps of: locating script code which creates at least one script URL while crawling a website (refer to 0111, 0161-0221), and examining the script code to obtain the script URL from the examination result (refer to 0111-0113, and 0222).

Stern does not expressly indicate execution of the script code to obtain the script URL.

Kraft discloses execution of the script code to obtain the script URL (refer to 0070).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to collect links by executing the script code from the web-pages.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that by making a system dynamically collecting links not only it speed up the process but also to reduce human errors and maintenance efforts.

28. Referring to Claim 40, Stern discloses electronic signals for use in the execution in a computer of a method for resolving Universal Resource Locators (URLs) (refer to 0115-0144, it is inherent that when execute the script code, it is a type of electronic signals), the method comprising steps of: locating script code which creates at least one script URL while crawling a website (refer to 0115 - 0144), and examining the script code to obtain the script URL from the examination result (refer to 0111-0113, and 0222).

Stern does not expressly indicate execution of the script code to obtain the script URL.

Kraft discloses execution of the script code to obtain the script URL (refer to 0070).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

collect links by executing the script code from the web-pages.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that by making a system dynamically collecting

links not only it speed up the process but also to reduce human errors and maintenance efforts.

29. Referring to Claim 41, Stern discloses a computer program product for use in the execution

in a computer of a method for resolving Universal Resource Locators (URLs) (web page, refer to

0024-0027), the computer program product comprising: a module for locating script code which

creates at least one script URL while crawling a website (web scrawler, refer to 11, Fig 1); and a

module for examining the script code to obtain the script URL from the examination result (data-

extract system, refer to 0075).

Stern does not expressly indicate execution of the script code to obtain the script URL.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

collect links by executing the script code from the web-pages.

The suggestion/motivation would have been that by making a system dynamically collecting

links not only it speed up the process but also to reduce human errors and maintenance efforts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

II. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern et al hereinafter Stern (US 2002/0052928) in view of Kraft et al (US 2002/0147637) hereinafter Kraft in further view of Meyerzon et al (US 6,424,966).hereinafter Meyerzon.

30. Referring to Claim 4, Stern discloses wherein the script code detector has a generating function (output, refer to 0225) when the script code detector locate a web page that uses script code to dynamically create at least one script URL (refer to 0115 – 0144).

Stern does not expressly disclose the notification.

Meyerzon discloses the notification (refer to Col 2, Lines 39-60)

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Stern and Meyerzon by including a notification within the system when locating a web page.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that by notify the system when created a or retrieve a script URL, it would let the user knowing the status of the system which is currently processing information so in the case when the system is stuck indefinitely in a site trying to retrieve the information (refer to 0223), the user will be notified.

31. Referring to Claim 14, Stern discloses wherein the website crawler has a script code detector for determining if a web page uses script code to dynamically create at least one script URL (refer to 0115 - 0118), a web page that uses script code to dynamically create at least one script

URL (refer to 0115-0144); and the web page loading controller controls (web browser, refer to

0026) loading of the located web page in response to the website crawler (refer to 0080).

Stern does not expressly disclose the notification.

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine Stern and Meyerzon by including a notification within the system when locating a web

page.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that by notify the system when created

a or retrieve a script URL, it would let the user knowing the status of the system which is

currently processing information so in the case when the system is stuck indefinitely in a site

trying to retrieve the information (refer to 0223), the user will be notified.

Conclusion

Examiner's Notes: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the

references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the

specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific

limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is

respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references

in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of

the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the

claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the

specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify

and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571)272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KT

KHANH DINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100